

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

ANTHONY CAIRNS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	CIVIL ACTION
vs.)	
)	FILE No.
DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

COMPLAINT

COMES NOW, ANTHONY CAIRNS, by and through the undersigned counsel, and files this, his Complaint against Defendant, DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD., pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* (“ADA”) and the ADA’s Accessibility Guidelines, 28 C.F.R. Part 36 (“ADAAG”). In support thereof, Plaintiff respectfully shows this Court as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This Court has original jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 for Plaintiff’s claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*, based upon Defendant’s DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD., failure to remove physical barriers to access and violations of Title III of the ADA.

PARTIES

2. Plaintiff ANTHONY CAIRNS (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) is and has been at all times relevant to the instant matter, a natural person residing in Dallas, Texas (Denton County).

3. Plaintiff is disabled as defined by the ADA.

4. Plaintiff is required to traverse in a wheelchair and is substantially limited in

performing one or more major life activities, including but not limited to: walking, standing, grabbing, grasping and/or pinching.

5. Plaintiff uses a wheelchair for mobility purposes.

6. Plaintiff is also an independent advocate of the rights of similarly situated disabled persons and is a “tester” for the purpose of enforcing Plaintiff’s civil rights, monitoring, determining and ensuring whether places of public accommodation are in compliance with the ADA. His motivation to return to a location, in part, stems from a desire to utilize ADA litigation to make Plaintiff’s community more accessible for Plaintiff and others; and pledges to do whatever is necessary to create the requisite standing to confer jurisdiction upon this Court so an injunction can be issued correcting the numerous ADA violations on this property, including returning to the Property as soon as it is accessible (“Advocacy Purposes”).

7. Defendant, DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD. (hereinafter “DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD.”) is a Texas limited company that transacts business in the State of Texas and within this judicial district.

8. Defendant, DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD., may be properly served with process via its registered agent for service, to wit: c/o Norman J. Hoppensein, Registered Agent, 3821 Matterhorn Drive, Plano, TX 75075.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

9. On or about November 12, 2020, Plaintiff was a customer at “Sofra Kebab House,” a business located at 910 W. Parker Road, Plano, TX 75075, referenced herein as “Sofra Kebab House”. *See* Receipt attached as Exhibit 1. *See* also photo of Plaintiff attached as Exhibit 2.

10. Defendant, DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD., is the owner or co-owner

of the real property and improvements that Sofra Kebab House is situated upon and that is the subject of this action, referenced herein as the “Property.”

11. Defendant, DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD., as property owner, is responsible for complying with the ADA for both the exterior portions and interior portions of the Property. Even if there is a lease between Defendant, DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD., and a tenant allocating responsibilities for ADA compliance within the unit the tenant operates, that lease is only between the property owner and the tenant and does not abrogate the Defendant’s requirement to comply with the ADA for the entire Property it owns, including the interior portions of the Property which are public accommodations. *See* 28 CFR § 36.201(b).

12. Plaintiff’s access to Sofra Kebab House and other businesses at the Property, located at 910 W. Parker Road, Plano, TX 75075, Collin County Property Appraiser’s property identification number 177408 (“the Property”), and/or full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, foods, drinks, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein were denied and/or limited because of his disabilities, and he will be denied and/or limited in the future unless and until Defendant is compelled to remove the physical barriers to access and correct the ADA violations that exist at the Property, including those set forth in this Complaint.

13. Plaintiff lives 8 miles from the Property.

14. Plaintiff has visited the Property at least once before as a customer and advocate for the disabled. Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Property within six months after the barriers to access detailed in this Complaint are removed and the Property are accessible again. The purpose of the revisit is to be a return customer, to determine if and when the Property are made accessible and to maintain standing for this lawsuit for Advocacy Purposes.

15. Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Property to purchase goods and/or services as a

return customer as well as for Advocacy Purposes, but does not intend to re-expose himself to the ongoing barriers to access and engage in a futile gesture of visiting the public accommodation known to Plaintiff to have numerous and continuing barriers to access.

16. Plaintiff travelled to the Property as a customer and as an independent advocate for the disabled, encountered barriers to access at the Property, suffered legal harm and legal injury, and will continue to suffer such harm and injury as a result of the illegal barriers to access present at the Property.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE ADA AND ADAAG

17. On July 26, 1990, Congress enacted the Americans with Disabilities Act 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.*

18. Congress found, among other things, that:

- (i) some 43,000,000 Americans have one or more physical or mental disabilities, and this number is increasing as the population as a whole is growing older;
- (ii) historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities, and, despite some improvements, such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem;
- (iii) discrimination against individuals with disabilities persists in such critical areas as employment, housing public accommodations, education, transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services, voting, and access to public services;
- (iv) individuals with disabilities continually encounter various forms of discrimination, including outright intentional exclusion, the discriminatory effects of architectural, transportation, and communication barriers, overprotective rules and policies, failure to make modifications to existing facilities and practices, exclusionary qualification standards and criteria, segregation, and relegation to lesser service, programs, activities, benefits, jobs, or other opportunities; and

- (v) the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous, and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary expenses resulting from dependency and non-productivity.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(a)(1) - (3), (5) and (9).

19. Congress explicitly stated that the purpose of the ADA was to:

- (i) provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities;
- (ii) provide a clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities; and

* * * * *

- (iv) invoke the sweep of congressional authority, including the power to enforce the fourteenth amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced day-to-day by people with disabilities.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)(1)(2) and (4).

20. The congressional legislation provided places of public accommodation one and a half years from the enactment of the ADA to implement its requirements.

21. The effective date of Title III of the ADA was January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

22. The Property is a public accommodation and service establishment.

23. Pursuant to the mandates of 42 U.S.C. § 12134(a), on July 26, 1991, the Department of Justice and Office of Attorney General promulgated federal regulations to implement the requirements of the ADA. 28 C.F.R. Part 36.

24. Public accommodations were required to conform to these regulations by January 26, 1992 (or by January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of

\$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

25. The Property must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

26. Plaintiff has attempted to, and has to the extent possible, accessed the Property in his capacity as a customer at the Property and as an independent advocate for the disabled, but could not fully do so because of his disabilities resulting from the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

27. Plaintiff intends to visit the Property again as a customer and as an independent advocate for the disabled, in order to utilize all of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations commonly offered at the Property, but will be unable to fully do so because of his disability and the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

28. Defendant, DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD., has discriminated against Plaintiff (and others with disabilities) by denying his access to, and full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the Property, as prohibited by, and by failing to remove architectural barriers as required by, 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

29. Defendant, DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD., will continue to

discriminate against Plaintiff and others with disabilities unless and until Defendant, DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD., is compelled to remove all physical barriers that exist at the Property, including those specifically set forth herein, and make the Property accessible to and usable by Plaintiff and other persons with disabilities.

30. A specific list of unlawful physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations which Plaintiff experienced and/or observed that precluded and/or limited Plaintiff's access to the Property and the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of the Property include, but are not limited to:

ACCESSIBLE ELEMENTS:

- (i) For the exterior access route in front of Unit 910 and 920, due to a policy of not having parking stops for the parking spaces directly in front of the exterior access route coupled with the policy of placing newspaper dispensers and a large trash can in the exterior access route, cars routinely pull up all the way to the curb and the "nose" of the vehicle extends into the access route causing the exterior access route to routinely have clear widths below the minimum thirty-six (36") inch requirement specified by Section 403.5.1 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access exterior public features of the Property.
- (ii) For the exterior access route in front of Unit 910 and 920, due to a policy of not having parking stops for the parking spaces directly in front of the exterior access route coupled with the policy of placing newspaper dispensers and a large trash can in the exterior access route, cars routinely pull up all the way to the curb and the "nose" of the vehicle extends into the access route as a result, in violation of

Section 502.7 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards, parking spaces are not properly designed so that parked cars and vans cannot obstruct the required clear width of adjacent accessible routes.

- (iii) Due to the barriers to access identified in (i) and (ii) above, this building of the Property lacks an accessible route connecting accessible facilities, accessible elements and/or accessible spaces of the Property in violation of Section 206.2.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property.
- (iv) Near Unit 920 (Charlie DoNuts), one accessible parking space has a cross-slope in excess of 1:48 in violation of Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards and is not level. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.
- (v) Near Unit 920 (Charlie DoNuts), one accessible parking space is missing an identification sign in violation of Section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.
- (vi) Near Unit 920 (Charlie DoNuts), the Property has an accessible ramp leading from the accessible parking space to the accessible entrances with a slope exceeding 1:12 in violation of Section 405.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- (vii) For the building containing Units 910 and 920, the Property lacks an accessible route from the sidewalk to the accessible entrances in violation of Section 206.2.1

of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

- (viii) Near Unit 920, due to lack of parking stops for the parking spaces adjacent to the accessible ramp in front of Unit 920, when a car pulls up in the adjacent parking space, it will block the access route from this ramp which is the only accessible route from the two accessible parking spaces. So as a result, the Property lacks an accessible route from these accessible parking spaces to the accessible entrances of the Property in violation of Section 208.3.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- (ix) There are multiple buildings on the Property, some are directly adjacent to one another, however, there is no accessible route connecting the buildings together in violation of Section 206.2.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property.
- (x) Near Taipei Station (Bldg 930 Unit 410), the Property has an accessible ramp leading from the accessible parking space to the accessible entrances with a slope exceeding 1:12 in violation of Section 405.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- (xi) Near Taipei Station (Bldg 930 Unit 410), due to the presence a column, the landing at the top of the curb accessible ramp does not have 36 (thirty-six) inch clear space in violation of Section 406.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This

violation would make it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to access the Property.

- (xii) Near Taipei Station (Bldg 930 Unit 410), there a vertical rise at the base of the accessible ramp that is in excess of a $\frac{1}{4}$ of an inch, in violation of Sections 303.2 and 405.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property.
- (xiii) Near Unit 3200, both accessible parking spaces and the associated access aisle have a slope in excess of 1:48 in violation of Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards and are not level. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.
- (xiv) Near Unit 3200, there is at least one accessible parking space that does not have a marked access aisle in violation of Section 502.3.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the accessible entrances of the Property.
- (xv) Near Unit 3200, there is at least one accessible parking space is not located on the shortest distance to the accessible route leading to the accessible entrances in violation of Section 208.3.1 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- (xvi) For the exterior accessible route near Unit 3200 and in front of the accessible parking spaces and regular parking spaces in this location, due to a policy of not having parking stops for the parking spaces directly in front of the exterior access route, cars routinely pull up all the way to the curb and the "nose" of the vehicle extends into the access route causing the exterior access route to routinely have

clear widths below the minimum thirty-six (36") inch requirement specified by Section 403.5.1 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access exterior public features of the Property.

- (xvii) For the exterior accessible route near Unit 3200 and in front of the accessible parking spaces and regular parking spaces in this location, cars routinely pull up all the way to the curb and the "nose" of the vehicle extends into the access route as a result, in violation of Section 502.7 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards, parking spaces are not properly designed so that parked cars and vans cannot obstruct the required clear width of adjacent accessible routes.
- (xviii) Near Unit 520 (Taylor Drug & Medical, Inc.), the access aisle to the accessible parking space is not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.
- (xix) Near Unit 520 (Taylor Drug & Medical, Inc.), the accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the accessible parking space in violation of Section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation would make it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to exit/enter their vehicle.
- (xx) Near Unit 520 (Taylor Drug & Medical, Inc.), the accessible parking space is not level due to the presence of accessible ramp side flares in the accessible parking space in violation of Sections 502.4 and 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.

This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.

- (xxi) Near Unit 520 (Taylor Drug & Medical, Inc.), the accessible parking space and associated access aisle have a slope and cross-slope in excess of 1:48 in violation of Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards and are not level. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.
- (xxii) Near Unit 520 (Taylor Drug & Medical, Inc.), the accessible parking space and associated access aisle have an opening with a width in excess of ½ inch, in violation of Sections 302.3 and 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.
- (xxiii) Near Texas Family Fitness, three accessible parking spaces are not located on the shortest distance to the accessible route leading to the accessible entrances in violation of Section 208.3.1 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- (xxiv) Near Texas Family Fitness, due to a policy of placing a parking stop in the access aisle, there is at least one access aisle that has a vertical rise in excess of ¼ inch in height and is in violation of Section 303.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.
- (xxv) Near Texas Family Fitness, due to a policy of placing a parking stop in the access aisle, this parking stop encourages a vehicle to park in the access aisle in violation of section 502.3.3 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation would make it

dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.

(xxvi) Near Texas Family Fitness there are five accessible parking spaces, leading from the eastern-most accessible parking space is an accessible ramp. Due to a failure to maintain the foliage on the Property, the branches of the trees and/or landscaping directly over the accessible ramp decreased vertical clearance to less than the 80 (eighty) inches in violation of Section 307.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to traverse the accessible routes of the Property.

(xxvii) Near Texas Family Fitness there are five accessible parking spaces, leading from the eastern-most accessible parking spaces is an accessible ramp. There is a vertical rise in excess of $\frac{1}{4}$ inch along the accessible route leading to this ramp, in violation of Sections 303.2 and 405.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property.

(xxviii) Near Omni Furniture Gallery, the Property has an accessible ramp leading to the accessible entrances with a slope and cross-slope exceeding 1:12 in violation of Section 405.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

(xxix) Near Omni Furniture Gallery, the required handrails on both sides of the accessible ramp are only present on one side in violation of Section 505.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

(xxx) Near Unit 380, the walking surfaces of the accessible route have a slope in excess of 1:20 in violation of Section 403.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property. As the accessible route is in excess of 1:20, it is considered an accessible ramp, moreover, it has a total rise greater than six (6) inches, yet does not have handrails in compliance with Section 505 of the 2010 ADAAG standards, this is a violation of Section 405.8 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

(xxxi) Near Unit 350, the walking surfaces of the accessible route have a slope in excess of 1:20 in violation of Section 403.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property. As the accessible route is in excess of 1:20, it is considered an accessible ramp, moreover, it has a total rise greater than six (6) inches, yet does not have handrails in compliance with Section 505 of the 2010 ADAAG standards, this is a violation of Section 405.8 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

(xxxii) Near Unit 350, there are two accessible parking spaces that are missing identification signs in violation of Section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.

(xxxiii) Near Unit 910 100B, due to a failure to enact a policy of proper maintenance, there is a buildup of concrete in the access aisle, the access aisle is in violation of Section 303.2 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

(xxxiv) Near Unit 910 100B, the Property has an accessible ramp leading from the accessible parking space to the accessible entrances with a slope exceeding 1:12 in violation of Section 405.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

(xxxv) Defendant fails to adhere to a policy, practice and procedure to ensure that all facilities are readily accessible to and usable by disabled individuals.

31. The violations enumerated above may not be a complete list of the barriers, conditions or violations encountered by Plaintiff and/or which exist at the Property.

32. Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Property in order to determine all of the discriminatory conditions present at the Property in violation of the ADA.

33. The removal of the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations alleged herein is readily achievable and can be accomplished and carried out without significant difficulty or expense. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv); 42 U.S.C. § 12181(9); 28 C.F.R. § 36.304.

34. All of the violations alleged herein are readily achievable to modify to bring the Property into compliance with the ADA.

35. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is readily achievable because the nature and cost of the modifications are relatively low.

36. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and

dangerous conditions present at the Property is readily achievable because Defendant, DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD., has the financial resources to make the necessary modifications since all four Properties are valued at \$10,107,165.00 according to the Property Appraiser website.

37. The removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is also readily achievable because Defendant has available to it a \$5,000.00 tax credit and up to a \$15,000.00 tax deduction available from the IRS for spending money on accessibility modifications.

38. Upon information and good faith belief, the Property have been altered since 2010.

39. In instances where the 2010 ADAAG standards do not apply, the 1991 ADAAG standards apply, and all of the alleged violations set forth herein can be modified to comply with the 1991 ADAAG standards.

40. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, is suffering irreparable harm, and reasonably anticipates that he will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless and until Defendant, DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD., is required to remove the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property, including those alleged herein.

41. Plaintiff's requested relief serves the public interest.

42. The benefit to Plaintiff and the public of the relief outweighs any resulting detriment to Defendant, DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD.

43. Plaintiff's counsel is entitled to recover its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of litigation from Defendant, DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD., pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 12188 and 12205.

44. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a), this Court is provided authority to grant injunctive relief to Plaintiff, including the issuance of an Order directing Defendant, DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD., to modify the Property to the extent required by the ADA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays as follows:

- (a) That the Court find Defendant, DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD., in violation of the ADA and ADAAG;
- (b) That the Court issue a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant, DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD., from continuing their discriminatory practices;
- (c) That the Court issue an Order requiring Defendant, DAVID HOPPENSTEIN FAMILY, LTD., to (i) remove the physical barriers to access and (ii) alter the subject Property to make it readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA;
- (d) That the Court award Plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs; and
- (e) That the Court grant such further relief as deemed just and equitable in light of the circumstances.

Dated: December 2, 2020.

Respectfully submitted,

Law Offices of
THE SCHAPIRO LAW GROUP, P.L.

/s/ Douglas S. Schapiro
Douglas S. Schapiro, Esq.
State Bar No. 54538FL
Attorney-in-Charge of Plaintiff
The Schapiro Law Group, P.L.
7301-A W. Palmetto Park Rd., #100A
Boca Raton, FL 33433

Tel: (561) 807-7388

Email: schapiro@schapirolawgroup.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF
ANTHONY CAIRNS